DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 726 SP 029 982

AUTHOR McNelis, Mary Costner; Etheridge, Carol Plata
TITLE Comparative Analysis of Three Models of Induction Internships.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Mobile, AL, November 1987). For related documents, see SP 029 979-981.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Comparative Analysis; Higher Education; *Internship Programs; Mentors; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Interns; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction

ABSTRACT

This study investigated differences in internship activities engaged in by subjects completing three different culminating field experiences and differences in attitudes held by the subjects toward various aspects of school personnel and school students. The three programs were: the traditional 10-12 weeks of student teaching; a phased nine-month internship; and a total immersion nine-month internship. The subjects were secondary education majors, 50 of whom had completed the traditional program, 30 had completed the phased program, and 17 had completed the total immersion internship. Descriptions are given of the salient features of each of the three programs. A discussion is presented on results in the areas of: (1) involvement in teaching activities; (2) instructional implementation activities; (3) instructional recordkeeping activities; (4) non-instructional activities; (5) instructional preparation activities; and (6) interns' attitudes toward the internship, their mentors and students, and their school's faculty, organization, and physical/cultural environment. Data gathered in the study are presented in 11 tables and some references are included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291726

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE MODELS OF INDUCTION INTERNSHIPS

by

Mary Costner McNelis

Carol Plata Etheridge

Center of Excellence in Teacher Education
Memphis State University
Memphis, Tennessee

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. P. Etheridge

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented in the

Symposium: Overview and Analysis of Three Models of Teacher Induction

Mid-South Educational Research Association Annual Meeting
Mobile, AL
November 1987

SP 029 982

Recent years have brought debate over the most effective ways to prepare teachers. Reports on teacher education and teaching such as those of the Holmes Group (1986), Carnegie Forum on Education and Economy (1986), and the National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985) have suggested that our schools need teachers who are more able and better prepared. Among their calls for reform is more cooperation between professionals in institutions of higher education and the public schools. One effort to answer this call has resulted in the development of fifth year teacher preparation programs that rely on the teaching internship as a major component.

The state of Tennessee's Board of Education in October, 1986 set forth a framework for improving teacher education with one recommendation being a one-year internship. In September, 1987 teacher education policy in Tennessee was revised by the state board and the one year teaching internship recommendation was revised to either a one semester field experience or a full school year internship. This policy shift reflects what Bolam (1987) and McDonald (1982) have noted: that research on field experiences does not clearly point the way for those who plan such experiences for teacher preparation curriculums. Little systematic inquiry exists to guide decisions about whether initial teaching experiences should be through

internships or traditional student teaching. Further, research in the area of whether longer field experiences are better is inconclusive (Hersch, Hull and Leighton, 1982).

This paper reports findings from a study of three culminating field experience models. It sought to document selected experiences from two fifth-year teaching internship experiences and compare them with the experiences of students completing traditional student teaching. Two questions were addressed: 1) What are the teaching activities engaged in by students completing each program and do the activities vary among models? 2) Do teacher candidates completing the three preparation programs vary in their attitudes toward their internships, mentor support, students and school-related features?

Overview of Three Culminating Field Experience Models

At Memphis State University a unique situation exists where three different types of culminating field experiences are operational in programs for secondary teachers: 10-12 weeks of student teaching, a graduated nine-month internship, and a total immersion nine-month internship.

Traditional student teaching. The traditional student teaching model is a culminating experience for teacher preparation students who are completing a four-year baccalaureate program in secondary education. In their student teaching placements, students are assigned to and

housed with a classroom teacher called a cooperating teacher. Thus there is close and constant contact with the cooperating teacher who is a model, guide, and evaluator.

Student teaching consists of a 10-12 week experience beginning with observations of the cooperating classroom teacher. Over time, the student teacher gradually assumes teaching responsibilities until all of the cooperating teacher's teaching duties are assumed by the student, including having sole responsibility for designing and implementing instruction. A supervisor from the university and the classroom teacher provide corrective feedback and evaluation. In this paper, students completing a student teaching experience are referred to as 4-year subjects.

Graduated internship. An extended phased internship is the focal experience for students completing a 15 month Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) degree. This internship places students in public school classrooms with practicing classroom teachers called mentors. The interns are housed in the same classrooms with their mentoring teachers, thus contact is constant and close. The mentoring teachers observe, advise and evaluate the interns. Pedagogical mentors (education professors) from the university also observe, advise, and evaluate the interns.

Internship phases consist of three experiences through which interns are placed in at least three different junior

or senior high school settings. The first phase consists of two three-week, half-day placements in two different school systems in junior and senior high school levels. These initial placements provide opportunities for interns to observe and assist the classroom teachers in various teaching responsibilities. In the second phase -- a seven-week, half-day placement -- interns gradually assume complete responsibility for two classes.

During the third phase -- a semester-long, all day placement -- the interns usually remain in the same school and with the classroom teachers to whom they were assigned for the second phase. The interns immediately assume complete teaching responsibilities for two classes, assist the mentoring teacher with two classes, and have two periods for planning. Interns are expected to participate in all activities associated with teaching and were also engaged in data collection for their thesis requirement. Subjects participating in this experience are referred to here as Internship 1 subjects.

Total immersion year-long internship. This internship is the focal experience for students completing a 12 month graduate level certification program. Interns are employed as half-time teachers, teaching 3 classes and assuming other responsibilities, such as homeroom and participation in extracurricular activities. The

internships begin with the opening of school in the Fall and end when the school year is over. Classroom teachers in the schools are assigned to the interns as mentors and two mentors from the university (specialists in methodology and subject matter) also assist the interns. The classroom teacher mentors are expected to observe and advise the interns, but do not evaluate them. Students participating in this type of internship are referred to as Internship 2 subjects in this report.

Methodology

Data Collection

Data were collected at the end of the 1986-87 internship experiences using the Teacher Induction Inventory (TII). The TII assesses students' perceptions of their involvement in various teaching activities that could occur during the internship. Data reported here have been obtained through seven of the scales comprising the inventory. One is a six point, Likert-type scale which asks interns to rate their levels of involvement in 28 teaching activities. The others are semantic differential scales which measure intern attitudes toward the internships, mentor support, and school related features.

Data Analysis

Group means of involvement in the internship activities were analyzed using a oneway analysis of variance followed by a Scheffe post-hoc procedure to determine statistically significant differences among the pairs.

Total score group means from each semantic differenial scale were analyzed using oneway analysis of variance and with the Scheffe post hoc procedure, when appropriate.

Subjects

The subjects were secondary education majors completing one of three teacher preparation programs at Memphis State University in 1986-87: 50 had completed a traditional student teaching experience (4-year subjects), 30 had completed the phased year-long internship (internship 1 subjects), and 17 had completed the total immersion, year-long internship (internship 2 subjects).

The 4-year subjects ranged in age from 21 to 48 with a median age of 25. The Internship 1 subjects ranged in age from 22 to 56 with a median age of 38.5. The Internship 2 subjects ranged in age from 24 to 50 with a median age of 32 (see Table 1).

Both sexes were adequately represented within the groups -- 18 males and 32 females in the student teacher group; 11 males and 19 females in Internship 1; 8 males and 9 females in Internship 2 (see Table 1).

Most major academic content areas were represented in each subject group including social science, science, mathematics, English, foreign language, and art. (see Table 2).

Subjects in each group had placements in both junior and senior high schools with one Internship 1 student placed in an elementary school (see Table 3).

Results

Involvement in teaching activities

As shown in Table 4, involvement in teaching activities is grouped into four catagories: instructional implementation (teacher-student interactions designed to promote student learning); instructional recordkeeping (documenting or keeping track of information related to grades, attendance, conduct, etc.); non-instructional activities (observing, conferencing, or meeting with school-related people but not students); and instructional preparation activities (preparing instruction related plans, materials, and activities to be used in instructional implementation).

Instructional implementation activities. No significant differences among the groups were found for involvement in instructional implementation activities. Monitoring and assisting students and providing large group

instruction showed the highest levels of involvement for all three groups. Tutoring individual students and directing laboratory activities were shown to have the lowest level of involvement in all three groups. This reflects the mode of teaching typical at the secondary level.

Instructional recordkeeping activities. No significant differences among the groups were found regarding instructional recordkeeping (see Table 4). All groups assumed responsibility for these activities. For the variations noted, such as responsibility for homeroom, maintaining records, and grading papers, none differed significantly.

Non-instructional activities. Significant differences existed among groups on six items of non-instructional activities. Observing classroom instruction and observing non-instructional activities showed significantly ($p<.01$) more participation by 4-Year and Internship 1 groups than the Internship 2 group. These groups were housed with their mentoring teachers. The proximity 4-Year and Internship 1 subjects had to mentors may have provided more opportunities for observation than was available for Internship 2 subjects who were housed in classrooms separate from their mentors.

The activities attending faculty meetings, participation in parent conferences, and participation in school and department meetings showed a significantly

greater ($p<.01$) level of participation by the Internship 2 subjects. These results reflect the program objectives. Internship 2 subjects were paid employees of the school systems and were viewed as regular teachers and thus expected to participate in all teacher activities. Internship 1 subjects had complete responsibility for their classes for one entire semester and were also expected to engage in these activities. However, they were not school employees, so may not have felt compelled to attend meetings. The 4-Year subjects, though expected to participate in the same activities, showed less participation possibly because their involvement and teaching roles were considerably constricted and were viewed more as students than the other two groups.

Finally, for the category talking with other teachers, Internship 1 subjects showed significantly lower ($p<.01$) levels of participation than either Internship 2 or 4-Year subjects. It is not known why the Internship 1 group reported significantly lower levels of contact with other teachers, but some programmatic factors may be related to the difference. Internship 2 subjects did not have constant and close contact with a mentor and may have obtained assistance from other teachers. Internship 1 subjects were paired with at least three different teachers over the course of their internship and met weekly in small seminar groups with a pedagogical mentor. Because of this planned

access to other information sources and support, they may not have needed the assistance of other teachers in the school. Further, Internship 1 subjects were engaged in data collection and library research for their thesis requirement. They may not have wanted to expend time with other teachers unless absolutely necessary.

Instructional Preparation Activities. No significant differences were found to exist among the three groups for levels of involvement in instructional preparation. All three groups reported high levels of participation in preparing instructional materials, designing daily lesson plans, designing tests and evaluations, and developing instructional units.

The Internship

As data in Table 5 indicate the Internship 1 and 4-Year subjects were found to have significantly ($p<.05$) more positive attitudes toward the internship than did the Internship 2 group. Closer examination of the individual adjective pairs reveals that this difference was likely due to the difference noted ($p<.01$) for Tense/Relaxed.

Mentor Support

Data in Table 6 indicate that the 4-Year subjects had significantly ($p<.05$) more positive attitudes toward their mentor/supervising teacher than did the Internship 2 subjects. These differences were found for 5 scaled pairs.

While most significant differences occurring in adjective pairs are between Internship 2 and 4-Year groups, Helpful/Not Helpful is the only pair to show significant differences involving all three groups. Internship 2 subjects viewed their classroom mentors to be less helpful than did Internship 1 and 4-Year groups. This finding is consistant with data reported earlier relative to lack of involvement with assigned mentors.

While the initial analysis yielded a significant difference among the group perceptions of their pedagogical mentors, the post hoc analysis yielded no significant differences between the paired group means (see Table 7).

The perceived tenseness of the internship by the Internship 2 subjects and their less positive views of their classroom mentors may be related to the fact that these subjects were on their own, with complete teaching responsibility from the first day of the internship and had limited access to their mentors. Internship 1 and 4-Year subjects, because of their close proximity to their mentoring teachers, had a support person readily available and their immersion into teaching was more gradual and thus, less tense.

Interns' Views of Schools and Students

As indicated in Table 8, significant differences ($p<.01$) existed between 4-Year and Internship 2 subjects

with regard to organization of the schools. Both groups viewed schools as organized, but the 4-Year group viewed the schools as more organized than did the Internship 2 group. All groups viewed the schools as being restrictive and authoritarian with Internship 2 subjects exhibiting a significantly more negative view.

Results shown in Table 9 indicate that all subjects viewed school faculties positively, though 4-Year subjects were significantly ($p<.01$) more positive. The 4-Year subjects viewed school faculties to be more helpful and supportive than the Internship 1 group and viewed school faculties to be more positive and encouraging than the Internship 2 group. With regard to sharing, the 4-Year subjects viewed school faculties to be more sharing than did either of the internship subjects.

Regarding how interns viewed their students, 4-Year subjects were more positive than either of the other groups (see Table 10). Significant differences ($p<.01$) occurred between 4-Year and Internship 2 groups, with the 4-Year group viewing students as more responsible and cooperative. The 4-Year group viewed students significantly ($p<.01$) more positively than did either internship groups.

Regarding school environments, the 4-Year group again exhibited a more positive view than did the other two groups (see Table 11). These subjects reported the school cultures as more academic.

Overall, upon completion of the internship, 4-Year subjects (students teaching group) held more positive views of schools and school components. Studies summarized by Hersh, Hull, and Leighton (1982, p.1815) criticize the student teaching model because of attitude changes associated with it, including a decrease in idealism. Data reported here indicate that student teaching subjects held the more positive views and that the least positive views were held by the total immersion internship subjects. These subjects, as part time teachers, had to assume the roles and responsibilities of teachers for as extended period of time and thus had more opportunity to become familiar with the realities of the workplace. In addition, 4-year students' median age was 13.5 years younger than the Internship 1 group and 6.5 years younger than the Internship 2 group (see Table 1). This suggests that 4-Year students may have viewed schools through the idealism of youth and lack of involvement in the complex role of teaching.

Summary

Through administration of the Teacher Induction Inventory (TII) this study investigated 1) differences in internship activities engaged in by subjects completing three different culminating field experiences and 2) differences in attitudes held by the subjects toward various aspects of school personnel and school students. The three programs under scrutiny were: traditional 10-12 week student teaching, a phased nine-month internship, and a total immersion nine-month internship. Major findings were:

1. No significant differences existed among groups relating to levels of involvement in instructional implementation activities, instructional recordkeeping activities, and instructional preparation activities.

2. Significant differences occurred in the non-instructional activities category. Student teachers and phased internship students reported significantly higher levels of participation in observations of classroom instruction and observations of non-instructional activities.

3. Subjects in the total immersion internship reported significantly more participation in parent conferences and school and department meetings.

4. Subjects in the phased internship reported significantly lower levels of talking with other teachers in the school than did student teachers or interns in the total immersion program.

5. Subjects completing the total immersion internship viewed their experiences to be significantly more tense than did those completing student teaching or the phased internship.

6. Student teachers and phased internship students viewed their classroom teacher mentors as significantly more helpful than did total immersion internship students.

7. Student teachers viewed schools, teachers, and their students more positively than did the other subjects.

8. Student teachers rated the schools as significantly more organized and less authoritarian than did total immersion subjects.

9. Student teachers viewed their students as being significantly more responsible and cooperative than did the total immersion interns and significantly more interested than did either of the two internship model groups.

10. Student teachers viewed school environment as more academic and facilitating.

Table 1

Demographic Data for Teacher Induction Subjects

AGE

	Median	Range	Mean	SD
4-Year	23	21-48	24.9	6.22
Intership 1	38.5	22-56	35.6	9.99
Intership 2	32	24-50	31.76	6.99

SEX

	Male	Female
4-Year	18	32
Internship 1	11	19
Internship 2	8	9

RACE

	White	Black
4-Year	41	9
Internship 1	28	2
Internship 2	15	2

Table 2

Content Areas of Teacher Induction Subjects

	4-Year	Intern 1	Intern 2
English	8	8	5
Math	4	3	3
Science	3	5	6
Social Science	11	5	1
Art	1	1	1
Music	5	2	
Business	3	4	
Foreign Lan.	1	1	1
Special Ed.	2		
Physical Ed.	5		
Home Ec	4	1	

Table 3

School Settings of Interns and Students Teachers

SCHOOL TYPE	4-Year	Intern 1	Intern 2
Senior High	33	23	14
Junior High	17	6	3
Elementary		1	

Table 4

Intern Involvement in Teaching Activities

0 = no involvement 5 = high involvement

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
INSTRUCTIONAL IMPLEMENTATION				
Tutoring Individual Students	2.70 1.61	2.96 1.40	2.94 1.43	
Monitoring/Assisting Students	4.33 .99	4.07 .92	4.35 .78	
Providing Small Group Instruction	3.37 1.59	3.55 1.43	3.47 1.28	
Providing Large Group Instruction	4.33 1.33	4.10 1.65	4.53 .72	
Directing Laboratory Activities	2.20 2.16	2.32 2.16	1.41 2.15	
Using Materials, Equipment, etc.	4.20 .94	4.10 .94	3.88 1.11	
INSTRUCTIONAL RECORD KEEPING				
Taking Roll	4.53 1.01	4.55 .91	4.53 1.12	
Grading Papers, Tests, Lab Work	4.81 .59	4.86 .35	5.00 .00	
Being Responsible for Homeroom	2.73 2.06	3.17 1.71	2.63 2.33	
Maintaining Records	4.17 1.18	4.62 .68	4.41 .62	

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 4 continued

Intern Involvement in Teaching Activities

0 = no involvement 5 = high involvement

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
NON-INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES				
Observing Classroom Instruction	4.11 1.11	4.10 1.0	3.18 1.18	1-3,2-3 **
Observing Non-Instructional Act.	3.92 1.12	4.00 1.13	2.38 1.54	1-3,2-3 **
Observing Other Teachers	3.11 1.60	2.66 1.23	3.24 1.25	
Interacting with Teachers/Admin	4.15 1.19	3.52 1.18	4.29 .92	*
Assisting with Extracurr. Act.	2.81 1.17	2.89 1.45	3.24 1.85	
Attending Faculty Meetings	2.98 1.84	3.55 1.53	4.82 .73	1-3,2-3 **
Participate Parent Conferences	1.30 1.61	2.45 1.76	3.65 1.17	1-2,2-3 **
Participate School/Dept Meetings	1.63 1.62	2.36 1.72	3.88 1.36	1-2,2-3 **
Conference with Classroom Mentor	4.17 1.26	4.55 .78	3.69 1.40	
Conference with University Mentor	3.19 1.63	3.90 1.17	3.35 1.41	
Talking with Other Teachers	4.26 1.05	3.48 1.18	4.41 .94	1-2,2-3 **
Meeting Other Teachers/Sch Staff	4.04 1.37	3.36 1.28	4.24 .97	*

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 4 continued

Intern Involvement in Teaching Activities

0 = no involvement 5 = high involvement

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
INSTRUCTIONAL PREPARATION				
Preparing Instructional Materials	4.69 .64	4.62 .82	4.69 .60	
Reviewing Curr. Guides/Resourses	3.80 1.17	3.86 1.41	3.76 1.30	
Designing Daily Lesson Plans	4.56 .96	4.59 .73	4.62 .72	
Designing Daily Tests/Evaluations	4.26 1.06	4.28 1.03	4.47 .71	
Developing Student Profiles	2.56 1.77	2.24 1.35	2.42 1.66	
Developing Instructional Units	4.41 .90	4.34 .94	4.12 1.17	

* = $p < .05$ ** = $p < .01$

Table 5

Intern Views of Internship Experiences

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
Contrived/Free	3.89 .97	3.90 .80	3.44 1.09	
Tense/Relaxed	3.58 1.12	3.83 .95	2.35 1.32	1-3.2-3 **
Irrelevant/Relevant	4.70 .64	4.67 .61	4.47 .87	
Not Helpful/Helpful	4.77 .54	4.77 .57	4.65 .70	
Restrictive/Permissive	3.62 1.00	3.70 1.09	3.18 1.18	
Negative/Positive	4.58 .95	4.37 .96	4.35 1.00	
TOTAL	25.10 3.45	25.20 3.83	22.20 4.58	1-3,2-3 *

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Table 6

Intern Views of Classroom Teacher Mentor

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Not Helpful/Helpful	4.78 .57	4.10 .81	4.00 1.21	1-3,2-3	*
(1)Negative/Positive	4.78 .63	4.60 .67	4.25 .93	1-3	*
(1)NonSupportive/Supportive	4.81 .65	4.63 .67	4.19 1.05	1-3	*
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	3.90 1.07	3.70 1.15	4.25 .86		
(1)Discouraging/Encouraging	4.71 .72	4.67 .66	4.19 .91	1-3	*
(1)Nonsharing/Sharing	4.77 .57	4.53 .86	4.37 1.20		*
(1)Unavailable/Available	4.85 .56	4.60 .77	4.31 1.08	1-3	*
TOTAL	32.4 4.06	31.3 4.19	29.5 5.60	1-3	*

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Table 7

Intern Views of Pedogogical Mentor

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS
(1)Not helpful/Helpful	4.41 1.05	4.03 1.30	4.12 1.22	
(1)Negative/Positive	4.69 .61	4.47 .86	4.53 .87	*
(1)Nonsupportive/Supportive	4.65 .76	4.43 .93	4.59 .71	
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	3.81 1.02	3.67 .96	3.88 1.36	
(1)Discouraging/Encouraging	4.64 .78	4.43 1.01	4.53 .87	
(1)Nonsharing/Sharing	4.48 .90	4.03 1.13	4.12 1.27	
(1)Unavailable/Available	4.38 .94	3.83 1.23	4.35 1.11	
TOTAL	31.00 4.99	28.90 5.72	30.10 5.90	

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Table 8

Intern Views of School Organization

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Unorganized/Organized	4.28 .93	3.69 .87	3.47 1.42	1-3	**
(1)Tense/Relaxed	3.27 1.05	2.76 .87	2.59 1.32		**
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	2.86 1.01	2.65 .94	2.24 1.34		*
(1)Authoritarian/Democratic	2.69 1.02	2.55 1.05	1.82 1.13	1-3	**
TOTAL	12.90 2.84	11.60 2.52	10.10 3.71	1-3	**

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Table 9

Intern Views of School Faculties

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Not Helpful/Helpful	4.47 .82	3.83 .91	4.18 .81	1-2	**
(1)Negative/Positive	4.34 .90	3.80 .92	3.53 1.23	1-3	**
(1)Nonsupportive/Supportive	4.32 .94	3.73 .91	3.88 1.11	1-2	**
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	3.30 .85	3.33 .66	3.29 1.10		
(1)Discouraging/Encouraging	4.22 .87	3.77 .86	3.50 1.21	1-3	**
(1)Nonsharing/Sharing	4.18 .88	3.57 .82	3.88 1.11	1-3	**
TOTAL	24.70 4.23	22.00 3.98	22.00 4.78	1-2	**

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Table 10

Intern Views of Students

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Incapable/Capable	4.15 .91	3.83 .98	3.76 1.03		**
(1)Irresponsible/Responsible	3.17 .97	2.97 .93	2.29 .98	1-3	**
(1)Unhappy/Happy	3.64 .81	3.67 .99	3.59 .94		*
(1)Disinterested/Interested	3.56 .75	3.03 1.10	2.59 1.00	1-2.1-3	**
(1)Uncooperative/Cooperative	3.74 .76	3.43 .93	3.06 1.30	1-3	**
TOTAL	18.20 3.27	16.90 3.86	15.20 3.89	1-3	**

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

Table 11

Intern Views of School Physical/Cultural Environment

1 = negative, 5 = positive

ITEM	4-YR X/SD	INT1 X/SD	INT2 X/SD	SIGN DIFF PAIRS	
(1)Unsafe/Safe	4.11 .85	4.03 .85	4.00 .71		
(1)Non-Academic/Academic	4.11 .80	3.33 .96	3.76 .75	1-2	**
(1)Restrictive/Permissive	2.69 .85	3.00 .91	2.29 1.21		**
(1)Hindering/Facilitating	3.72 .88	3.17 .98	3.06 1.09	1-3	**
(1)Stifling/Stimulating	3.52 .99	3.33 1.03	3.12 1.05		*
TOTAL	18.20 2.77	16.80 3.05	16.20 2.38		**

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$

References

Bolam, R. (1987). Induction of beginning teachers. In M.J. Duncan (Ed.), The international encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education (pp. 745-757). Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: The Forum.

Hersh, R.H., Hull, R., & Leighton, M.S. (1982). Student teaching. in H.E. Mitzel (Ed.) Encyclopedia of educational research. (5th ed.) Free Press: New York. (pp. 1812 - 1822).

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's Teachers. East Lansing, Mich: The Holmes Group.

McDonald, F.J. (1980). Study of induction programs for beginning teachers: The problems of beginning teachers: Vol. 1. A crisis in training. Princeton N.J.:Educational Testing Service.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education (1985). A call for change in teacher education. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.